REMARKS

Claims 1 - 12 were rejected in the previous office action dated 09/01/2005 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Barnes. Applicants overcame this rejection through amendments and arguments presented in their response dated 09/30/2005. The Examiner has withdrawn that rejection in the present office action dated 02/16/2006.

Claims 1 - 16 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Barnes, and further in view of "Getting Results with Microsoft Office 97", pp. 169 - 181. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection for the following reason.

Anderson, Barnes, and Office do not describe, either separately or when take together, all of the steps required by applicants' claim 1. The cited portions of Anderson, e.g., column 10, line 58 - column 11, line 30, and fig 4H-J were cited in the previous rejection which was withdrawn. The same arguments apply. The addition of Office, page 174 describing creating links from cells in a spreadsheet to a word processor document so that changes in the cells are automatically updated in the word processor document does not now describe claim 1. In fact, Anderson's "group mode" of column 10, lines 18 - 31, already describes automatically copying information entered in a cell on one page of the group to the same cell in other pages of the group. Page 174 of Office, therefore, adds nothing new regarding copy-paste operation to what was known in the art at the time of Applicants priority date of 10/24/2000 as described in Anderson and Applicants' specification page 4, lines 19 - 30.

As previously argued, neither Anderson's "model copy

FR920000050US1   -2-   09/887,602

technique" nor his "group mode" technique describe defining
ranges of cells, each range of cells having the same size, and at
least two of said ranges having different addresses relative to
the top leftmost cell A1 of the respective page on which each of
said ranges are located. Indeed, Anderson's group mode does not
describe ranges because there is no need to define ranges. Claim
1 requires a set of ranges to be defined.

The automatic steps of claim 1, e.g., copying, determining,
identifying, and pasting are all performed using the set of
ranges of cells defined earlier in claim 1, and simply cannot be
performed without this definition which neither Anderson, nor
Barnes, nor Office describe.

Anderson column 7, line 62 - column 8, line 11 is also
cited; however, no definition of a set of ranges of cells is
found in this citation either.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Anderson, Barnes, and
Office. Applicants respectfully request such allowance.
Independent claim 12 recites identical requirements as claim 1
and is allowable for the same reason. All of the remaining
claims are dependent directly or indirectly on allowable claims 1
or 11 and are therefore also allowable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection
under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and allowance of all of the pending
claims.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and
such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain,
however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in

FR920000050US1   -3-   09/887,602

condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 04/11/06   By: _John Pivnichny_
                           John R. Pivnichny
                           Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358
Fax: (607)429-4119

FR920000050US1   -4-   09/887,602